

REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing Amendment, claims 1-28 and 39-64 are pending in the present application. Claims 9 and 20 have been amended to correct typographical errors and claims 6 and 8 have been amended for reasons other than patentability; new claims 39-64 have been added; and claims 29-38 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating claims 2, 12, and 13 as including allowable subject matter. In view of the following Remarks, indication of the allowability of the remaining pending claims is requested.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Bayerl for granting Applicants' undersigned representative and Robert Randa, an inventor and representative of the Assignee of this application, the courtesies of an Examiner Interview on November 17, 2004, the substance of which is set forth below.

Claim of Priority

The Examiner has requested clarification of the Applicants' claim of priority. In particular, the Examiner has requested that Applicants clarify the disclosure in view of the Declaration. To accommodate the Examiner's request, Applicants have amended the Specification to specify the relationship of the present application with regard to the other identified applications. Applicants will also file a Supplemental Oath to correct the error in claiming priority to an application that was not co-pending with the present application.

Terminal Disclaimer

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 20-21, 26-29, and 31-32 as allegedly being anticipated under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-41 of U.S. Patent No. 6,313,855 to Shuping *et al.* Applicants will consider filing a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome this rejection once the extent of the otherwise patentable subject matter for this application is determined.

The Examiner has also provisionally rejected claims 1-3, 20-21, 26-29, and 31-32 as allegedly being anticipated under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-68 of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/985,415 to Shuping *et al.* Again, Applicants will consider filing a Terminal Disclaimer to overcome this rejection once the extent of the otherwise patentable subject matter for this application is determined.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 6, 9-11, 14-16, 20-21, and 26-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over International Publication WO 97/29414 to AT&T Corp. (AT&T) in view of Bukszar *et al.*, U.S. Patent 6,133,916 (Bukszar). The Examiner has rejected claims 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AT&T in view of Bukszar and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,838,326 to Card *et al.* ("Card"). The Examiner has rejected claims 4-5, 7-8, 22-25, and 33-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over AT&T in view of Bukszar and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,433,795 to MacNaughton *et al.* ("MacNaughton"). Applicants traverse these rejections because AT&T is not properly combinable with Bukszar (or any of the other references relied upon by the Examiner) because AT&T teaches away from various features set forth in the claims.

AT&T, at page 1, lines 9-26, teaches that:

A frustrating aspect of the information revolution is that the ease of accessing on-line material has not kept pace with the growth in the amount of material that is available. For example, advances in hardware, compression techniques, editing tools, and web browsers have facilitated the creation of material containing inlined images (images that appear on a web page with text). Inlined images are a popular way in which to create eye-catching text and graphics that would be difficult or impossible to create using the capabilities of hypertext markup language (HTML). However, accessing web pages with interesting inlined images typically involves browsing through web pages of material by clicking on hypertext links. Although browsing in this way is often rewarding, it requires a good deal of attention on the part of the person who is browsing and can be burdensome.

Given this problem, AT&T apparently teaches that “the system extracts embedded image URLs from the web pages” and displays the images for the user. See e.g., AT&T at page 2, lines 30-33, and at page 3, lines 8-10. AT&T apparently also teaches that when the user selects one of the images, the full web page may be retrieved and displayed. See e.g., AT&T at page 3, lines 10-16.

Because of these teachings, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine AT&T with a reference, such as Bukszar, that teaches rendering more than just the image data, because AT&T ***teaches away from such a combination***. Accordingly, AT&T is not properly combinable with Bukszar. Neither Cragun or Card make up for the deficiencies of AT&T in this regard. Thus, Examiner has failed to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness and he must withdraw all his pending rejections of the claims.

New claims 39-64 either depend from one or more of the above-referenced claims or include features similar to those in the claims discussed above. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the Examiner is not able to set forth a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to the new claims either.


CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: **December 27, 2004**

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Rick A. Toering
Registration No. 43,195

Customer No. 00909

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102
Main: 703-905-2000
Direct Dial: 703-905-2120
Fax: 703-905-2500